

Application No.09/687,414
Amendment Dated January 28, 2004
Reply to the Final Office Action of October 28, 2003

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, and 15 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Claims 2, 8, and 14 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by *Kenner et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,314,565 in view of *Stedman et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,262,726. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

In view of the above claim amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 17

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kenner et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,314,565 in view of *Stedman et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,262,726, and further in view of *Hsu*, U.S. Patent No. 5,894,515. Applicants respectfully

Application No.09/687,414
Amendment Dated January 28, 2004
Reply to the Final Office Action of October 28, 2003

traverse this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 2, 8, and 14 have been canceled. Relative to dependent claims 5, 11, and 17, these dependent claims depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively. Since these dependent claims depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 13, and Applicants believe they have successfully traversed the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 7, and 13, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 5, 11, and 17.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kenner et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,314,565 in view of *Stedman et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,262,726, and further in view of *Hsu*, U.S. Patent No. 5,894,515 and *Hayes, Jr.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,205,476. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Relative to dependent claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18, these dependent claims depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively. Since these dependent claims depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 13, and Applicants believe they have successfully traversed the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 7, and 13, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18.

Application No.09/687,414
Amendment Dated January 28, 2004
Reply to the Final Office Action of October 28, 2003

Conclusion

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is hereby solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Howard Glaser et al.

By: 
Prentiss Wayne Johnson, Reg. No. 33,123
Attorney for Applicants
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
555 Bailey Avenue, J46A/G467
San Jose, CA 95141-9989
Telephone: 408.463.5673

Date: Amendment Dated January 28, 2004